

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

PLINTRON TECHNOLOGIES USA LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOSEPH PHILLIPS, RICHARD PELLY,
THOMAS MATHEW, GREG MCKERVEY,
and DESIREE MICHELLE GRAY,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-00093

ORDER ON FURTHER
DISCOVERY MOTION
PROCEDURE

JOSEPH PHILLIPS,

Counterclaim Plaintiff,

v.

PLINTRON TECHNOLOGIES USA LLC,

Counterclaim Defendant.

1 This matter comes before the Court sua sponte. As of the date of this Order, the Parties
2 have at least ten motions for the Court's consideration, no less than six of which are related to
3 discovery disputes. (See Dkt. Nos. 90, 94, 99/100, 101/102, 107, 109.) The Court intends to issue
4 rulings on all pending motions currently under consideration. However, in light of the Parties'
5 litigious response to the disputes arising from discovery in this case, the Court finds it necessary
6 to impose certain limitations on further discovery motions in order to control its docket. See
7 Landis v. North American Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936) (discussing the court's inherent power
8 to "control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself,
9 for counsel, and for litigants.").

10 Therefore, the Court ORDERS that any further discovery motions brought by the Parties
11 follow the expedited joint motion procedures set forth in LCR 37(a). The Court further
12 recommends that the Parties utilize the expedited joint motion procedure for other non-
13 discovery, non-dispositive motion practice, as per LCR 37(a)(I).

14 The clerk is ordered to provide copies of this order to all counsel.

15 Dated February 12, 2025.

16 

17 Marsha J. Pechman
18 United States Senior District Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24